




Docket No.: 240669US-2

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

GREGORY J. MAIER
(703) 413-3000
GMAIER@OBLON.COM

SURINDER SACHAR
(703) 413-3000
SSACHAR@OBLON.COM

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/624,555

Applicants: Yukio TANIGUCHI, et al.

Filing Date: July 23, 2003

For: CRYSTALLIZATION APPARATUS,
CRYSTALLIZATION METHOD, THIN FILM
TRANSISTOR AND DISPLAY APPARATUS

Group Art Unit: 1756

Examiner: ROSASCO, S.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

Surinder Sachar

Registration No. 34,423



DOCKET NO: 240669US-2

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

YUKIO TANIGUCHI, ET AL.

SERIAL NO.: 10//624,555

FILED: JULY 23, 2003

:

:

:

:

EXAMINER: ROSASCO, S.

GROUP ART UNIT: 1756

FOR: CRYSTALLIZATION APPARATUS,
CRYSTALLIZATION METHOD, THIN
FILM TRANSISTOR AND DISPLAY
APPARATUS

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction requirement of May 20, 2005, Applicants elect, with traverse, the invention of Group I, Claims 1-23.

Applicants traverse the outstanding Restriction requirement on the grounds that it has not been established that it be an undue burden to examine each of the noted inventions and claims together.

Under M.P.E.P. § 803, a Restriction is not proper if a search and examination can be made without a serious burden on the Examiner, and the outstanding Restriction requirement has not established that examining each of the currently-pending claims together would result in an undue burden.

M.P.E.P. § 803 specifically states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

The outstanding Restriction requirement has not established that each of the claims could be examined without an undue burden, and thus each of the noted inventions and claims should be examined on their merits.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
GJM/SNS/des